

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this response, claims 2-10 are pending in the instant application, of which claim 2 is independent. Claims 1 and 11-16 have been previously canceled. Claim 2 has been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define over prior art.

**I. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 2-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0011842 by Hahnel et al. (hereinafter “Hahnel”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

At page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner notes that the detents of the fixing means are omitted from claim 1. The Examiner further suggests amending claim 1 to recite the structure of the pincers, pins, and their locations on the fixing means. Applicants believe the Examiner means to indicate claim 2, as claim 1 has been previously canceled.

In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend claim 2 herein to recite to recite *one or more detents extending parallel to and provided between a pair of the at least two gripping means*. Applicants further amend claim 2 to recite that the fixing means is connected to *the one or more detents*, wherein the at least two gripping means *and the one or more detents* protrude from the fixing means. Still further, claim 2 is amended to recite *wherein the one or more detents contact the at least one bearing cap in a protracted position such as to apply a force to the at least one bearing cap to clamp said at least one bearing cap being between said corresponding half-mandrel and said fixing means*. Applicants believe that these amendments address the Examiner’s concerns.

For example, Hahnel does not disclose at least *a fixing means connected to said at least two gripping means and the one or more detents, wherein the at least two gripping means and the one or more detents protrude from the fixing means*.

More specifically, Hahnel discusses a clamping and supporting fixture 8 having a stationary lower workpiece mount 10 as well as a workpiece counter mount 14 for advancing via

a slide 12 at right angles to the mounting axis A, and having a bearing cap support 16. *See* [0031].

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner points to “detents 16” of Hahnel. The Examiner indicates that the “fixing means” in Hahnel are defined by “the horizontal bar, the four middle legs, and the detents 16 of the counter mount 14.”

However, Hahnel’s device does not meet the requirement of claim 2 (as amended) that *the one or more detents protrude from the fixing means*. The element which the Examiner identifies as the “detents” 16 are described by Hahnel as “bearing cap supports.” Because the bearing cap supports 16 are provided entirely within and are surrounded by the “four middle legs” which the Examiner asserts are part of the fixing means (see, e.g., Hahnel at Fig. 1), the bearing cap supports 16 do not protrude from the fixing means as required by claim 2.

In contrast, Figure 1 of the present application, and the accompanying description, clearly shows that the detent 32 protrudes from the fixing means 22.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Hahnel does not include each and every feature of claim 2. Claims 3-8 and 10 depend from claim 2 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 2. Therefore, claims 3-8 and 10 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 2. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

## II. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahnel in view of any of U.S. Patent No. 6,457,621 by Hahnel et al. (hereinafter Hahnel II”), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023939 by Hase (hereinafter “Hase”) or U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0104864 by Knoll et al. (hereinafter “Knoll”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 9 depends from claim 2 and, as such, incorporates all of the features of claim 2. Applicant respectfully submits that any combination of Hahnel, Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 9. For example, the combination of Hahnel,

Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll does not teach or suggest *a fixing means connected to said at least two gripping means and the one or more detents, wherein the at least two gripping means and the one or more detents **protrude from the fixing mean***, as recited in Applicant's amended claim 2.

In light of the arguments presented above, Hahnel does not teach or suggest the above features of claim 2. Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll are cited to provide teachings for the feature added in claim 9. However, Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll fail at curing the shortcomings of Hahnel with respect to these features because none of Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest *a fixing means connected to said at least two gripping means and the one or more detents, wherein the at least two gripping means and the one or more detents **protrude from the fixing means***, as recited in Applicant's amended claim 2.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above comments, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. HEU-003USRCE2. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: August 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /John S. Curran/  
John S. Curran  
Registration No.: 50,445  
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127  
(617) 227-7400  
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant